UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,680	03/27/2007	Brian Anthony Retkin	09999-Murg 4657	
Albert T. Keyac	7590 05/07/200 ck	EXAMINER		
260 South Broad Street			COONEY, ADAM A	
Philadelphia, PA 19102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2444	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/595,680	RETKIN ET AL.
Examiner-indated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ADAM COONEY	2444
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>ADAM COONEY</u> .	(3)	
(2) Albert Keyack, Reg. No. 32,906.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 4 May 2009	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: none		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444		
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)
(1.	rr	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative of record, Mr. Albert Keyack, regarding whether or not a resposne to the most recent office action had been sent. Mr. Keyack stated that he is no longer with the firm and would call the firm in regards to the application and give the examiner a call back. A Mr. Robert Mckinely, registered number unknown, from the firm contacted the examiner and left a voice mail stating that the firm has no record of receiving the office action and wanted to know if the examiner would re-issue the office action and re-start the time for reply. The examiner gave Mr. Mckinley a call back, at 215-569-4892, and stated that there was nothing of record showing any error in the mailing of the office action and that there would be no reason to re-issue the office action Mr. Mckinley then stated that examiner does have that option to re-issue the office action in rare cases. The examiner told Mr. Mckinley he would give him a call back after talking with his supervisor. Examiner gave Mr. Keyack and Mr. Mckinley a call back on 05/05/2009 and left a voice mail stating that since Mr. Keyack is the attorney of record, and there is no record of a change in power of attorney, and since the office action was mailed to Mr. Keyack and the time period of reply has reached its statutory 6 month mark that the application is abandoned. Further, the examiner stated that Mr. Keyack could go through the proper channels to file a petition to not abandon the case, provided Mr. Keyack can show proof as to why the application shouldn't be abandoned. Lastly, the examiner stated that he could send a copy of the interview summary and notice of abandonment via fax to Mr. McKinley. Neither Mr. Keyack or Mr. McKinley returned the call. .